



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,666	03/17/2004	Nelson Chen		3295

7590 03/17/2008
SIRTEC INTERNATIONAL CO., LTD
P.O. Box 44-2049
Taipci, 10668
TAIWAN

EXAMINER

BAE, JI H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2115

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/801,666

Applicant(s)

CHEN, NELSON

Examiner

JI H. BAE

Art Unit

2115

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the examiner is unable to discern whether the embodiment shown in Fig. 1 represents prior art, or an embodiment of applicant's invention, since applicant refers to the embodiment shown in Fig. 1 as the "original power supply". Additionally, claim 1 appears to include elements of embodiments shown in both Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. Based on the applicant's disclosure, it is not clear that the two embodiments are practicable in the same invention.

For example, it is unclear to the examiner whether the embodiment in Fig. 2 represents an improvement over the prior art represented by Fig. 1, or whether Fig. 1 and 2 represent two different embodiments of the same invention. If Fig. 1 and 2 represent two different embodiments, it is further unclear as to whether Fig. 1 and 2 represent two separate embodiments, or if Fig. 2 represents an additional configuration for the embodiment shown in Fig. 1. For example, is the display unit 2 of Fig. 1 detachable and able to be mounted within an opening as shown in Fig. 2? Or does Fig. 1 represent a power supply device with a fixed display unit, representing one embodiment, while Fig. 2 represents a second embodiment that includes a power supply device with a mountable display unit?

Additionally, lines 5-9 of claim 1 are incomprehensible. Applicant switches from describing the power supply case to the computer case, with no transitional language indicated. It is further unclear whether this "embed opening" is intended to be part of the "display device".

Regarding claim 2, the phrase "and so on" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations before the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Since the scope of what is being claimed has not been clearly established by the applicant, the examiner interprets the claims as corresponding to that which is taught in Fig. 2 and 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yang, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055474.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Yang teaches a device comprising:

a power supply [Fig. 1, power supply 16],

an opening in the face of a computer case which provides for disposing a display unit in the face of the computer case [Fig. 2],

a display unit to display various functional states of the power supply, which is externally connected to the power supply [Fig. 1 and 2, display 40],

Art Unit: 2115

a processing unit connected to the display unit and power supply, the power supply providing information to the processing unit and display unit relating the function of the power supply [Fig. 1, microprocessor 32].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Anderson, U.S. Patent no. 5,982,147,

Chaiken, U.S. Patent No. 6,116,767,

Chang et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,081,719,

Caldes et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,793,627,

Mondshine et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,252,511,

Sakai et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,784,641.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JI H. BAE whose telephone number is (571)272-7181. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on 571-272-3667. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2115

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ji H. Bae
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2115
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
571-272-7181
ji.bae@uspto.gov

/Thomas Lee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2115